

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO | |
|--|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 10/710,931 | 08/13/2004 | Steven Sang | 13154-US-PA | 4930 | |
| 31561 75 | 590 11/03/2005 | | EXAMINER | | |
| JIANQ CHYUN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE | | | WILSON, ALLAN R | | |
| 7 FLOOR-1, N | O. 100 ROAD, SECTION 2 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| TAIPEI, 100 TAIWAN | | 2815 | | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005 | 5 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------|--|--|--|
| | 10/710,931 | SANG, STEVEN | | | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit . | | | |
| | Allan R. Wilson | 2815 | | | |

| | Allan R. Wilson | 2815 | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 20 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: | | | | | | | | |
| The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp | liance with 37 CEP 41 37 must be | filed within two month | e of the date of | | | | | |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of th | | | | | | |
| AMENDMENTS | | | | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); | | | | | | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or | ter form for appeal by materially re | ducing or simplifying | the issues for | | | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | corresponding number of finally rejo | ected claims. | | | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Co | mpliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). | | | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | • | | | | | | | |
| | 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the | | | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | I be entered and an e | explanation of | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | | |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | • | | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. So | al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1 | Is to provide a | | | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. **REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER** | | | | | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See attached sheet. | t does NOT place the application in | condition for allowar | nce because: | | | | | |
| I2. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)I3. Other: | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | • | | | | | | | |

Art Unit: 2815

For example, The argument that "In re Yamagata (Fig. 1E), has shown the structure with only one BJT being created. It also should be noted that the n-well 3 is connected to the system high voltage Vcc. Also and, the source region 9 is grounded. Basically, Yamagata failed to disclose the extended doped region 208 is adjacent to the source region 204a and the doped layer 206 in the same conductive type" is not persuasive. Vcc and ground are each common voltage terminals. Applicants do not claim the same voltage terminal. Additionally, connections to a device are considered functional use and not given full patentable weight. Yamagata does disclose the extended doped region 3 (from surface down) is adjacent to the source region 9 and the doped layer 3 (under 8 and 9) in the same conductive type. The extended doped region in Yamagata is adjacent, but not directly adjacent to the source as shown in Applicants' figures.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from an examiner should be directed to Primary Examiner Allan Wilson whose telephone number is (571) 272-1738. Examiner Wilson can normally be reached 7:00-4:00 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas can be reached on (571) 272-1664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Allan R. Wilson Primary Examiner

26 October 2005